

### REMARKS

Claims 1 to 5 and 13 to 17 remain active in this application.


Claim 1 to 5 and 13 to 17 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,277 B1 in view of Wong et al. (U.S. 6,233,466 B1). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the Wong et al. patent bears a filing date of April 8, 1999 which is subsequent to the effective filing date of the subject application of October 16, 1998 since the invention as claimed is fully disclosed in the priority document filed on that date. The priority document in the subject application is also dated prior to the priority document in Wong et al., even assuming that the priority document of Wong et al. discloses that which the examiner alleges to be shown to provide the rejection. The priority document of Wong et al. is not of record and therefore cannot be considered, even were the date thereof to be appropriate, which it is not

Still further, even assuming Wong et al. discloses that which the examiner alleges and bears a proper date under the statute, there is still no teaching or suggestion to combine Wong et al. with the invention claimed in Patent No. 6,233,466.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Jay M. Cantor  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 19,906  
(301) 424-0355 (Phone)  
(972) 917-5293 (Phone)  
(301) 279-0038 (Fax)